HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 20742 of 1995

31-10-2006

Between:
T.Rajgopal S/o t.Venkatachary, Professor in Botany, R/0 R-15, Osmania University Qtrs, Osmania University, Hyderabad – 7.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Osmania Unviersity, rep. By its Vice Chancellor, Osmania University, Hyderabad and three others.

.....RESPONDENTS

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

WRIT PETITON NO. 20742 OF 1995

O R D E R:

In this writ petition, the proceedings of the first respondent-University, dated 14-12-1992, wherein the first respondent has revised the dates of promotion of 19 persons, who were promoted under 'Merit Promotion Scheme', is challenged.

It is pointed out by the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents-University that likely affected parties namely, those 19 persons, who were beneficiaries under the impugned Proceedings are not made parties to the writ petition. It is also pointed out that in pursuance of the interim order granted by this Court on 15-09-1995, directing the respondents to consider the grievance of the petitioner raised in the writ petition, pursuant to the recommendations of the

Committee headed by

Sri Justice A. Gangadhara Rao, the respondent university has considered and passed orders on 05-06-1996, rejecting the claim of the petitioner for treating him as senior to 19 Professors, who were promoted under Merit Promotion Scheme.

The learned Counsel for the petitioner fairly stated that the said rejection order has not been challenged either by filing a fresh writ petition or seeking amendment to the present writ petition.

Whenever any proceedings are challenged, the persons, who are beneficiaries under those proceedings, are required to be impleaded, lest, in the event of setting aside of such proceedings, the beneficiaries under those proceedings will be affected. Since 19 Professors in whose favour the impugned proceedings were issued have not been made parties to this writ petition no relief can be granted to the petitioner in this writ petition. Since the petitioner failed to challenge the rejection order dated 05-06-1996, I am not inclined to consider the case of the petitioner on merits.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner to avail any remedy as available to him in law by removing the deficiencies as pointed out above. No costs.

31-10-2006

Mjl/*